

coming forward with its balanced budget, and then compare where our priorities are, and then work out our differences. And our differences can be worked out.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague for allowing us to participate in this special order. I just want to welcome, I know we have a new member, JESSE JACKSON, Jr., joined by Mr. FIELDS, to distinguished Members, and it is nice to serve in this body with them.

Mr. RIGGS. I very much appreciate the comments of the gentleman. I very much appreciate the participation from my colleagues. I am mindful that the San Francisco 49ers are playing the Minnesota Vikings.

I just want to reemphasize in closing the point that the gentleman made so beautifully. I really believe that there is bipartisan, I hope there is emerging bipartisan consensus in Washington and across this land that the American people want a 7-year balanced budget using honest numbers to save Medicare, returning power to families and to State and local governments, reforming welfare and providing tax relief for families and job creation.

I thank my colleagues again for their participation.

BALANCED BUDGET REQUIRES BALANCED APPROACH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of May 12, 1995, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. FIELDS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about America's budget. I think all of us tonight are in favor of a balanced budget. I am certainly in favor of a balanced budget. I think the big impasse that we have here in this Congress tonight is how we balance the budget, not whether or not we balance the budget in 7 years, 5 years, or 10 years.

The biggest issue that we are confronted with tonight is how do we balance the budget. I think there are too many people who want to balance the budget on the backs of the poor people and at the expense of the environment; who want to balance the budget at the expense of college students who are trying to matriculate in school and get a decent education; trying to balance the budget on the backs of individuals who want to go to schools that are drug-free and live in communities that are drug-free.

So I think that is the real issue that we are faced with tonight is, how do we, in fact, balance this budget.

In order to balance a budget, you ought to start with a balanced approach, and until we have a balanced approach, we will never have a balanced budget. This Government is shut down today because we do not have a balanced approach to balancing the budget. I want to stand tonight to talk about how we get to a point of bringing

about a balanced approach to balance the budget so that we can look to create an atmosphere for our children in the future.

If you look at this present budget, it cuts \$750 billion over 7 years. Quite frankly, I can stand tonight and be for a \$750 billion cut. But the issue is where do we cut the \$750 billion to balance the budget by 2002. Under this balanced budget amendment, it takes \$218 billion and gives it to the richest people in America. One percent of the people in this country will receive a tax break under this balanced budget.

The poorest people, 20 percent of the poorest people in America are impacted; the balanced budget affects them, 50 percent of those individuals will be affected by this balanced budget. Those cuts are on the backs of these individuals more so than it is on the backs of anybody else. Forty-seven percent of the proposed cuts goes to 12 percent of Americans who make \$100,000 or more.

So the issue tonight is not whether or not we balance the budget; the issue is how do we balance the budget; \$359 billion of the \$750 billion in cuts are in Medicare and Medicaid. Over 7 years, \$133 billion in Medicaid cuts will come about under this present balanced budget amendment.

□ 2145

Twenty-seven percent of those cuts will be in the Louisiana Medicaid Program. So I take a matter of personal privilege tonight to talk about how these cuts will affect constituents back home.

I do not come from a State that is very wealthy. I certainly do not represent a district that is very wealthy. I represent one of the poorest congressional districts in the entire country and the poorest congressional district in the State of Louisiana.

Medicaid cuts would deny benefits to about 3.8 million children. These are the individuals who can least defend themselves. They cannot come to the floor of the House. They cannot lobby in the Halls of the Congress. They cannot get on an airplane and fly to Washington, DC, and talk to Members of Congress. But they will be affected by these cuts.

Three hundred thirty thousand elderly people could be turned away from nursing homes. These are the elderly, the sick people in this country, who have put everything they had over the years into this country, who have worked hard. People say, well, it is an entitlement program.

We have had people who wake up every morning and go to work every day, and now they need the help of their Government. They have invested in Social Security. Now we have the audacity and the gall to stand here tonight and take an elderly person who has worked all of his or her life, take them out of a nursing home, and then turn around and give the richest person in this country a tax break, and the richest corporations.

The issue is not whether or not we balance the budget. The issue is how we balance it.

If I have two children, for example, and I have to cut back because I am spending too much, it is almost like telling one child, "I'm going to deny you a college education because Daddy can't afford it anymore," but at the same time I tell the other child, "I'm going to give you an increase in your allowance."

That is what we are doing under this budget. We are taking from the poorest people, our children, our elderly, and we are giving money to the richest people in this country, cutting Medicare by \$200-some billion and then giving a \$245 billion tax break.

From rural Louisiana, \$57.4 million in cuts resulting in higher taxes for 372,000 Louisianans. Families with one child, for example. We worked hard the last Congress to bring about something called an earned income tax credit, because we realized that we have to get people off the welfare rolls in this country and put them on payrolls.

We all agree to that. We all know that in order for us to have a country that utilizes the free enterprise system and builds dignity among people, we have to get people off welfare. So what did we do the last Congress? We included in the budget something called an earned income tax credit, because we wanted to give the people who were trying to go to work and make a decent and honest living a tax break. So individuals who have children, and individuals who make \$27,000, \$30,000 a year, we gave them a tax break because we want to reward them for the work that they do.

What are we doing today in this budget? We take away that tax credit to millions of families, and then we talk about how we want to get people off of welfare. The best way to get a person off of welfare is pay them for the work that they do and give them an opportunity, put value in work. This budget certainly does not do that.

We also, as a result, raise taxes on 12.6 million families with incomes of \$30,000 or less. That is what this budget will do; \$100 billion in cuts in food stamps and welfare programs.

I know there has been a lot of talk about how we need to downsize the welfare program in this country. I stand before you today, Mr. Speaker, and say in no uncertain terms that we need to downsize and we need to revitalize the welfare program in this country.

You are looking at one Member of Congress who believes that the welfare program in this country is very regressive and it needs to be more progressive. But how do we make welfare more progressive? We make it more progressive, in my opinion, by increasing job training, because many of the people on welfare do not have job skills.

What do we do in this budget? We cut job training programs. Are we serious about revitalizing and reforming welfare in this country? I would think not.

To add insult to injury, we take the child who we want to see off of the streets during the summertime, and the child who we would like to see do something constructive during the summertime, how do we penalize the child in this program? We tell children in this budget, about 4 million of them, that this summer they will not have a summer job.

Those are the kind of problems that we are having, real problems that we are having with this budget. Until we come with a balanced approach, we will never have a balanced budget, because if the philosophy here tonight is to balance the budget by giving the rich more and giving those who can least help and defend themselves less, then we will never come to a balanced budget agreement.

Student loans, for example, cut by \$10.2 billion at a time when less kids are taking advantage of college opportunities. Why? Because many of them do not have the financial resources.

So should we stand here tonight and say, OK, let us balance the budget in 7 years; if you want to cut student loans, cut it for the sake of balancing the budget. I would feel a little better if we were not giving a \$245 tax break to the richest people in America.

That is why we have an impasse tonight. That is why the Members of this Congress not should but must sit down and talk about how we really can bring about a balanced budget for our children and for our country.

Last, before I yield to a distinguished colleague of mine, I want to talk about the increased interest rates on student loans.

Now when you are in college and you take out a student loan, you have a 6-month grace period. What kind of Congress are we, when we take a grace period away from a college student who just graduated from college and who just took out a student loan and who does not even have a job, for crying out loud?

We tell this college student, "We are going to balance this budget on your back," but yet we want every kid to go to college. We want them off welfare. We want them off the streets in the summertime, but we take away their summer jobs. And we have the audacity to stand on this floor and talk about it is the best thing to do, we have got to balance this budget.

There is nothing wrong with balancing a budget, but it is how we balance it. Do we penalize people who can least help themselves, young college students?

I see that I have been joined by my distinguished friend and colleague from the great State of Illinois. Let me just welcome the gentleman to this august body and welcome him to this U.S. Congress where I have been awaiting his arrival. It is good to have him here.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my good friend the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. JACKSON] for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. I thank the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. FIELDS] for yielding me time this evening.

We really need to stop kidding the American people. I support a balanced budget. Most Democrats do. But can we project natural disasters for the next 7 years? Can we project hurricanes on the east coast for the next 7 years? Earthquakes on the west coast for the next 7 years? Or floods in the Midwest? Can we project wars present and unseen? Are we making decisions for a Congress yet to be elected severely restricting their ability to set the Nation's priorities as they see fit based on national need?

And so if you like I am tired of hearing Republicans talking about the Federal budget deficit and the debt, those who are primarily responsible for deliberately creating deficits acting like they are actually concerned about them, then maybe you are ready to listen to something real about reducing budget deficits.

How did we get in this mess? David Stockman, Ronald Reagan's Director of Office of Management and Budget, revealed first in the Atlantic Monthly and later in his book that the Republican strategy in 1981 was to deliberately create huge budget deficits and dramatically drive up the national debt as a way of forcing cutbacks in domestic social spending.

For a little bit of perspective. For over 200 years from George Washington to Jimmy Carter, the accumulated national debt was \$908 billion. After just 12 years of Reagan and Bush economic policies, huge tax breaks for the rich, originally \$750 billion, reduced in 1983 to \$600 billion, and massive military spending, \$750 billion over 5 years, the debt actually quadrupled to nearly \$4 trillion. One expert has estimated that tax cuts enacted since the late 1970's for the richest 1 percent of families cost the Federal treasury \$164 billion in 1992.

For example, \$84 billion in decreased revenues and \$80 billion in interest on the accumulated debt. The Reagan-Bush fiscal policies which on the one hand allowed the rich to pay less for their fair share of taxes, on the other hand forced the Government to borrow from them to finance the debt, a double bonanza for the very wealthiest Americans.

The deficit must be put in perspective. Deficit fixation and attempts to cut the deficit too deeply and too quickly can paralyze efforts to bring about much needed domestic change. It can drag the economy down, increase unemployment, and actually increase the deficit itself.

Borrowing per se is not necessarily bad. Borrowing to buy a house or to fund one's education is different than borrowing to pay off a gambling debt or to buy drugs or to buy alcohol. Therefore, there is an important difference between consumption expenditures and investment expenditures.

Additionally, if one takes out a mortgage on a house and then gets a pro-

motion and a significant salary increase on their job, the mortgage payment actually becomes less burdensome. Therefore, the size of the deficit in and of itself is not a drag on the economy. When business does not expand, it is because of lack of demand, not necessarily because of the budget deficit. Thus if the economy were to become a high-growth, high-wage, full-employment economy, the burden of the deficit would actually decline.

Another argument from the Republicans for deficit reduction is that the deficit pushes up interest rates. During the 1980s, when the deficit shot up, interest rates remained essentially the same. Why? Because there is a much stronger link between Federal Reserve policies and rising interest rates than there are between the deficit and rising interest rates.

Perspective also means seeing the deficit in relationship to the size of the economy. The sum may be large in 1995, but in 1945 due to the unprecedented size of wartime expenditures, the Federal deficit was more than 22 percent of GDP, compared to roughly 5 percent in 1993. A rise in unemployment and the resulting loss of production that often ensues is a far worse drain on the economy than the deficit.

In Germany, for example, with the Weimar government's memory of hyperinflation in the 1920's and high unemployment during the depression of the 1930's—among union members in 1932 it was 44 percent—they chose classic budget deficit reduction policies instead of government spending on public works and an expansion of the money supply. The resulting mass unemployment helped to pave the road to fascism.

Obsession with the budget deficit creates even more tragic deficits. Our deficits are also in rundown infrastructure of our roads, of our bridges, of our airports, of waste disposal facilities and lack of environmental protection. They are also in our failure to combat crime and drugs and in a significant part of a generation growing up semiliterate, in an unending cycle of poverty.

Our deficits are in an educational system increasingly falling behind other systems in the world, and in gaps in child care, health care and inadequate housing of millions of Americans.

We are a Nation of enormous national wealth. We are just tragically suffering from an anemia of national will to do what we know is just.

The gentleman mentioned a few moments ago a mother and her children. If a mother has three children, and two pork chops, she does not conclude that she has one excess child. A mother takes two pork chops and she makes gravy and she expands that meal to take care of three children.

That is what a caring mother should do. It is certainly what caring Government should do.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Let me just say to the gentleman, he mentioned the 12 years of Republican leadership as relates to how they dealt with the budget and how they dealt with spending. The gentleman makes a very valid point. I think they used to call it voodoo economics.

Basically what took place for 12 years, and one of the reasons, not the only reason, but one of the reasons why we find ourselves in the mess that we are in today is because for 12 years the Republican philosophy was if you give the rich a tax break, then we have something called a trickle-down effect. If you give rich people a tax break, give the corporations a tax break, it will trickle down and create jobs.

What happened was it did not trickle down. The rich just got richer and the poor got poorer and now we find ourselves with this big deficit.

Let me go back to the educational piece, because I think that is a core part of my debate and my resistance in terms of this budget, is because the way we penalize the elderly with Medicare, but also how we penalize people who are trying to better themselves.

□ 2200

You take the national service program for example, AmeriCorps, a program that you and I both are strong advocates of. We know that there are so many parents in America who are right now caught in the middle. They make a little bit too much money to qualify for government assistance but do not make enough money to send their kids to college.

So we came up with the idea of a national service program so that kids could go to college and earn their way through college, pay their student loans after they finish college by participating in the national service program. They eliminate that program. The issue is not whether or not we balance the budget tonight. The issue is how we balance the budget. Do we have a balanced approach in balancing the budget?

Drug-free schools and communities, the gentleman from Chicago, he knows the problems that we have. He knows about the problems that we have in schools. I recall many times visiting his district as a college student, and we both went from school to school speaking to kids about staying away from drugs and alcohol. This budget eliminates, a cut over half of the drug-free schools and communities money, \$466 million; it cuts \$266 million, not when drugs in our schools and communities are going down but going up. So those are some of the real problems that Members on our side of the aisle have with this budget agreement.

The other thing I wanted to talk about, and that was the CRA. This budget, if you are a bank, for example, with under \$100 million in assets, you do not have to comply with CRA standards. So you are going to have less investment in communities across this Nation as a result of this budget.

There are real problems with this budget. If the gentleman is familiar with the Head Start Program, and I will be happy to yield to the gentleman after I talk about this Head Start Program. Head Start cuts, for example, 135 million in 1996 alone and it freezes funding that would deny 180,000 children the opportunity of Head Start.

I am a product of the Head Start Program. Here again, I take a moment of personal privilege. I do not know how many Members of Congress actually participated in the Head Start Program, but I did. I know what the Head Start Program did for me. Cutting it like we are doing in this budget is wrong.

The summer jobs program. I do not know if the gentleman from Chicago participated in the summer jobs, but I qualified for a summer job when I was going to school. The first time I was able to punch a clock was when I received my first summer job. It taught me personal responsibilities on the job, gave me job training. Every Saturday, every Monday through Friday I had to get up in the morning during the summertime and go to work, taught me job ethic. We wipe it out in this budget.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Let me thank the distinguished gentleman from Louisiana for yielding once again.

During the course of my most recent campaign in the Second Congressional District, I had the privilege of speaking at Bowen High School, around 89th and Commercial on the South Side of Chicago. I was meeting with the principal, Mrs. Alvarez in her office. I happened to notice on a mural that was in her office, I saw African Americans and Haitians, male and female, all going to work at a steel mill known as USX, United States Steel. In the middle of this mural was a large furnace. Out of the back of that furnace was coming rail and coming engines and coming bridges and tremendous infrastructure.

Two blocks from Bowen High School is 600 abandoned acres of United States Steel where USX used to be. If you step outside of the principal's office now, you see metal detectors. There are students at Bowen High School wearing uniforms. What are you saying? I am saying that there is a relationship between that mural, between those metal detectors, between the behavior of our children, between the absence of those jobs and the number one growth industry in our country: jails.

We have more public housing, more public housing has been in the form of jails in the last year than it has been in the form of building public housing and affordable housing for the American people, while it costs more for us to incarcerate Americans in jails than it does to put Americans through college and put them back to work.

So, we must not only measure our budget deficit in terms of numbers, which the Republicans so skillfully illustrate on this floor, we must measure our budget deficit in our failure as a nation to reinvest not only in our in-

frastructure but, most importantly, in our people. When we reinvest in our people, the return on our investment actually plays a role in reducing the deficit.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the environment, if the gentleman would bear with me just for a moment, because that is another issue that is very important in this budget.

EPA cuts: EPA enforcement alone is cut by 25 percent. To cut EPA enforcement by 25 percent at a time that more companies are polluting and at a time that we need to be more environmentally conscious, not only in the country but in the world. Certainly you can have the best department of environmental quality or environmental protection that you want, but if you do not have the law enforcement officers out there enforcing the law, then what difference does it make? We can pass all the rules and regulations we want in this Congress, but if we do not have the enforcement mechanism to go out and make sure that companies abide by the laws and rules and regulations to make our environment safe, make our water clean, our air clean and our soil clean, then it matters not what kind of legislation we pass—not to mention—safe drinking water and clean water fund, cut by 45 percent.

I mean, almost 50 percent of those dollars are cut. I am talking about moneys that are being cut with no studies, no rhyme or reason, just sitting around the table, saying cut it for the sake of cutting it because we want to give people who make \$100,000 and people who make \$200,000 a year a tax break. We want to give the wealthiest people in this country a tax break. That, I suggest to you, my friend, is wrong.

I would hope that in the remaining weeks of this year, I would hope that we could sit down and talk about real solutions to a real problem. We have a real problem in this country. Neither you nor I are naive to the extent that we do not realize we a budget problem. I did not create this problem. My colleague certainly did not create it because he just got here. I got here about 3 years ago.

But I want to solve it. I want to be a part of the solution. And in order for us to solve this problem, we have to do it with a clear conscience. We have to sit around the table, and we have to cut some programs that, quite frankly speaking, need to be cut.

I am not standing at this mike, and neither are you, saying, do not cut. Yes, we need to cut. We need to reorganize the way we do business in our country. We want to balance our checkbook. We want to do that. Seven years, 5 years, 10 years, we want to balance it. But we have got to balance it with conscience and we have to balance it in the most appropriate way and not just be punitive in nature.

I mean not just pull seniors out of nursing homes, not just cut people who

fought for this country, the veterans in this country, and close some of their hospitals. Not just take kids' summer jobs, for crying out loud, and taking away a little drug-free schools and communities program that benefits communities and schools. Not snatching milk from babies in the food stamp program and then give it to a big millionaire or a big corporation and then hold a press conference and say we balanced the budget. I think that is the biggest problem. Those are some of the problems that we have with balancing the budget.

If the gentleman wishes me to yield, I will be happy to yield, but I wanted to make those comments.

Mr. JACKSON of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to thank the gentleman once again for yielding.

I would go so far as to say that when we look and compare the Republican method of balancing the budget, they plan to balance the budget in 7 years with deep cuts in Medicare and Medicaid, four times greater than any health cuts in history, deep cuts in education, a rollback obviously in environmental protection, and a tax increase on working families.

The President's balanced budget approach is much different. He balances the budget in 7 years while protecting Medicare, Medicaid, education and the environment and targeting tax relief to the middle class without any new tax increase on working families.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. The issue here is about direction. Are we going to balance the budget on the backs of people who are poor and who are defenseless and cannot come and participate in this august body or part of this conversation? Who is asking and who is being asked to forgo what? Students are being asked to forgo interest rates on loans. Seniors are being asked to forgo Medicare.

There are 41 million Americans who have no form of health care at all and are not part of any debate. There are 19 million people who are working part-time jobs and they are being asked to forgo full-time work. There are 8 million homeless people, roughly 8 million homeless people who are being asked to forgo housing. There are youth who are being asked to forgo education. Our cities are being asked to forgo development while we balance this budget.

In my district, if I may take a moment of personal privilege, the cities of Harvey and Phoenix and Posen and Robbins and Dixmoor are being asked to forgo debt forgiveness while we can forgive the debt of Mexico. We can forgive the debt of the Soviet Union and former Eastern Bloc countries, but we cannot forgive the debt of townships in our own districts and in our own country.

There is nothing wrong with balancing the budget. We agreed that that should happen. The only issue is what direction that balanced budget should take.

Mr. FIELDS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from

Chicago. I want to thank him for his time tonight. Again, I welcome the gentleman to this august body. I enjoyed participating in this colloquy with the gentleman and want to thank him once again.

Let me just conclude by saying, we, as Members of this Congress, and as well as the executive branch of Government, we should, we must sit down and talk about balancing this budget and get this train moving again. Let me tell my colleagues, it is almost like a driver of a bus and a mechanic, a bus just breaking down on the side of the highway. And you have got a bunch of people on the bus. And the mechanic and the driver get into a big fight about what to do to get the bus moving again. The people on the bus do not really care about the differences between the driver and the mechanic. They just want to get to their next destination.

The American people really want to get to the next destination. We as grown men and women in this Congress, we must sit down and get this Government moving and open and balance the budget. But we must come to grips with the fact that we will not and we should not do it on the backs of the most defenseless people in this country, the elderly, the poor, and the young. And those people who are in the middle, who are trying to make a living, who are trying to do better, who are benefiting from the earned income tax credit. I would hope and pray that this Congress, this institution with all of its great wisdom, with its infinite wisdom would come to the conclusion that yes, we need to open our Government up. Yes, we need to move our Government forward. Yes, we need to balance our budget, and need to do it in a fair and equitable way.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, on December 15, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. McNULTY (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for December 15, after 3 p.m., for personal business.

Mr. STOKES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for December 15, for official business in the district.

Mr. TOWNS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for December 15, for official business in the district.

By unanimous consent, on December 15, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. YOUNG of Florida (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for December 15, for official business.

Mr. LIGHTFOOT (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for December 15, for a family emergency.

Mr. GUNDERSON (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for December 15 after 1 p.m., for personal reasons.

By unanimous consent, on December 15, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. HARMAN (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for December 15 after 5 p.m., for official business.

Mr. EDWARDS (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, for the birth of his son.

By unanimous consent, on December 15, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of a death in the family.

Ms. MOLINARI (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, for medical reasons.

Mrs. FOWLER (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, for official business.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. PALLONE) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. POSHARD, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. CLAYTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. OLVER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HINCHEY, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. BEREUTER) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SHADEGG, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HOKE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. LEWIS of Kentucky, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. KINGSTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. BEREUTER, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. DORNAN, for 5 minutes, today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1332. An act to clarify the application of certain Federal criminal laws to territories, possessions, and commonwealths, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. THOMAS, from the Committee on House Oversight, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 1747. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to permanently extend and clarify malpractice coverage for health centers, and for other purposes;

H.R. 1977. An act making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes;

H.R. 2099. An act making appropriations for the Department of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and for sundry independent agencies, boards, commissions, corporations, and offices for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes; and

H.R. 2336. An act to amend the Doug Barnard, Jr. 1996 Atlanta Centennial Olympic Games Commemorative Coin Act, and for other purposes.